



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,135	06/16/2005	Yukio Tsuruoka	273944US90PCT	2266
22850	7590	05/04/2009		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
ARCHER, CHRISTOPHER B				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2432				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/04/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/539,135

Applicant(s)

TSURUOKA ET AL.

Examiner

CHRISTOPHER B. ARCHER

Art Unit

2432

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 June 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/88)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/16/2005;08/09/2007;03/04/2008;06/17/2008
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The instant application having Application No. 10/539,135 filed on 06/16/2005 is presented for examination by the examiner.

Oath/Declaration

2. The applicant's oath/declaration has been reviewed by the examiner and is found to conform to the requirements prescribed in **37 C.F.R. 1.63**.

Priority

3. As required by **M.P.E.P. 201.14(c)**, acknowledgement is made of applicant's claim for priority based on applications filed on 08/29/2003 (Japan 2003-307582).

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1-14 are objected to as being generally narrative and fail to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. Correction, as appropriate, is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4 and 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda (JP 2002-351786), hereafter referred to as Maeda, in view of Yamaguchi (JP 06-348628), hereafter referred to as Yamaguchi, in view of Tanaka (JP 11-163924), hereafter referred to as Tanaka.

Regarding claim 1:

(Maeda [0020]) teaches a system that stores link information.

(Maeda [0040], [0041]) teaches a system that selects information to be changed.

(Maeda [0010]) teaches a system that can transmit the information to be changed.

However, Maeda fails to disclose that the selected link information contains the address of the transmitting party, and that the transmitting system will only update its own database when a successful update response is received.

(Yamaguchi [0010]) teaches a system that does not update its database until a successful update response is received.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Maeda to only update the communicating party's information when a successful update response has been received, as taught by Yamaguchi, to ensure database unification among the two databases.

However, Yamaguchi fails to disclose that the selected link information contains the address of the transmitting party.

(**Tanaka [0010]**) teaches a system that builds an address change message containing a transmission address, a keyword indicating that an update is taking place, an address before change, and the address to be changed to.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Maeda to include a transmission address, as taught by Tanaka, so that the receiving party can verify that the information to be changed was intended for them before making the changes to their own database.

Regarding claim 2:

(**Maeda [0066]**) teaches that if a received address change message corresponds to an address that has been previously stored in the receiver, the receiver will update the address information with the new address information in the address change transmission.

However, Maeda fails to mention a system in which the receiving party sends response information to the sending party when change information is received.

(**Yamaguchi [0010]**) teaches a system that does not update its database until a successful update response is received.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Maeda to only update the communicating party's information when a successful update response has been received, as taught by Yamaguchi, to ensure database unification among the two databases.

Regarding claim 3:

(Maeda [0065]) teaches that if a received address change message corresponds to an address that does not already exist in the receiver, the receiver registers the new address information.

Regarding claim 4:

Maeda fails to teach that addresses can be deleted from the receiving database given an indication from the communicating source.

It is commonly known in the art that database entries can be added, updated, and deleted.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Maeda to allow database entries to be deleted so that deleted users or accounts are removed from the system and the system resources can be conserved and reallocated.

Regarding claim 8:

(Maeda [0010]) teaches a system that can transmit link information to be changed.

However, Maeda fails to disclose that the selected link information contains the address of the transmitting party, and that the transmitting system will only update its own database when a successful update response is received.

(Yamaguchi [0010]) teaches a system that does not update its database until a successful update response is received.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Maeda to only update the communicating party's information when a successful update response has been received, as taught by Yamaguchi, to ensure database unification among the two databases.

However, Yamaguchi fails to disclose that the selected link information contains the address of the transmitting party.

(**Tanaka [0010]**) teaches a system that builds an address change message containing a transmission address, a keyword indicating that an update is taking place, an address before change, and the address to be changed to.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Maeda to include a transmission address, as taught by Tanaka, so that the receiving party can verify that the information to be changed was intended for them before making the changes to their own database.

Regarding claim 9:

(**Maeda [0010]**) teaches a system that updates the receiving party when update information is received.

However, Maeda fails to mention a system in which the receiving party sends response information to the sending party when change information is received.

(**Yamaguchi [0016]**) teaches a system that is capable of returning an update response to the sending party upon successful update of the receiving party.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Maeda to only update the communicating party's information when a successful update response has been received, as taught by Yamaguchi, to ensure database unification among the two databases.

Regarding claim 10:

(Maeda [0066]) teaches that if a received address change message corresponds to an address that has been previously stored in the receiver, the receiver will update the address information with the new address information in the address change transmission.

However, Maeda fails to teach that the transmitting system will only update its own database when a successful update response is received.

(Yamaguchi [0010]) teaches a system that does not update its database until a successful update response is received.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Maeda to only update the communicating party's information when a successful update response has been received, as taught by Yamaguchi, to ensure database unification among the two databases.

Regarding claim 11:

(Maeda [0065]) teaches that if a received address change message corresponds to an address that does not already exist in the receiver, the receiver registers the new address information.

Regarding claim 12:

Maeda fails to teach that addresses can be deleted from the receiving database given an indication from the communicating source.

It is commonly known in the art that database entries can be added, updated, and deleted.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Maeda to allow database entries to be deleted so that deleted users or accounts are removed from the system and the system resources can be conserved and reallocated.

7. Claims 5-7, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda, in view of Yamaguchi, in view of Tanaka, and further in view of Masui (JP 2002-208960), hereafter referred to as Masui.

Regarding claims 5 and 6:

Maeda discloses a link change information sending part, but does not explicitly disclose that the link change sending information part adds signature information to certify that the information is free from tampering.

(Masui [0069]) teaches a system in which update messages are transferred with key certificates to ensure the validity of the transmitted data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Maeda to include key certificates, as taught by Masui, to ensure

unification of data between the databases by preventing the addition of erroneously or maliciously modified data.

Regarding claim 7:

Maeda discloses an information storage list, but fails to explicitly disclose that this list contains key information relative to each user.

(Masui [0065]; Fig. 2, 103) teaches a system that contains key information for decoding information relative to each user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Maeda to include key information for each user, as taught by Masui, so that the receiving end can correctly decode messages and signatures sent from each user.

Regarding claim 13 and 14:

Maeda discloses a link change information sending part, but does not explicitly disclose that the link change sending information part adds signature information to certify that the information is free from tampering.

(Masui [0069]) teaches a system in which update messages are transferred with key certificates to ensure the validity of the transmitted data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Maeda to include key certificates, as taught by Masui, to ensure

unification of data between the databases by preventing the addition of erroneously or maliciously modified data.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER B. ARCHER whose telephone number is (571) 270-7308. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (571) 272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CHRISTOPHER B ARCHER/
Examiner, Art Unit 2432

/Gilberto Barron Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2432